G2BPGAMC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 CR 588 (ER) V. 5 AHMED MOHAMMED EL GAMMAL, 6 Defendant. 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. February 11, 2016 9 9:34 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. EDGARDO RAMOS, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 NEGAR TEKEEI BRENDAN F. OUIGLEY ANDREA LEE SURRATT 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 SABRINA SHROFF 20 DANIEL HABIB Attorneys for Defendant 21 22 23 24 25

1 (In open court)

(Case called

MS. TEKEEI: Good morning, your Honor. Negar Tekeei, Brendan Quigley and Andrea Surratt on behalf of the government.

MS. SHROFF: Good morning, your Honor. Sabrina Shroff and Daniel Habib on behalf of Mr. El Gammal, who is seated to my right.

THE COURT: Good morning to you both, and good morning, Mr. El Gammal. This matter is on for status conference; so Ms. Surratt or Ms. Tekeei or Mr. Quigley?

MS. TEKEEI: Thank you, your Honor. We'd like to update you on the status of discovery in this case. Since the last conference, the government has produced a significant amount of discovery, including the contents of cell phones and electronic devices that were seized from the defendant's residence and searched pursuant to a search warrant.

That includes various devices, an iPad, laptop hard drive, many gigabytes worth of data, and additional search warrant returns from social media and e-mail providers. At this point, there is no existing Rule 16 discovery that is awaiting production.

In terms of classified discovery, we've been working diligently to get the necessary approvals from various components within the government to produce those documents, to the extent they are discoverable. We are very close to

obtaining those approvals, and in anticipation of this, we sent defense counsel a copy of the CIPA Section 3 protective order. We also handed up a copy of that to your Honor's deputy just a little while ago.

This protective order has been approved by the Classified Information Security Officer, and it is the same, in substance, as a protective order that was signed by Judge Berman in U.S. v. Buryakhob very recently.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, U.S. versus who?

MS. TEKEEI: Buryakhob.

In addition, as part of our conversation with the different components of the government, we're required to communicate with an order to produce the classified discovery. We've been working to narrow the scope of any government motions that we might make under CIPA, although that remains a possibility.

THE COURT: Okay. So the classified materials, if any, have not yet been identified or made available to the defense?

MS. TEKEEI: They have not been made available to the defense yet. We have spent an enormous amount of time identifying the universe of those documents. Our office has reviewed each of those documents, and we are just awaiting the necessary approvals to produce the ones that are discoverable to the defendant. We are very close to getting those

approvals.

THE COURT: Can you give the defense any idea of when that approval might be obtained?

MS. TEKEEI: It is difficult to estimate an exact time frame, your Honor. We are very, very close; so close that we were prepared to send over the protective order. I don't want to give an exact date. It's hard to predict, you know, what, if any, additional issues may crop up, but we would hope to begin producing them as soon as possible, or the vast majority of them as soon as possible.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MS. TEKEEI: That is all, in terms of updates from us, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Ms. Shroff or Mr. Habib, have you had an opportunity to review the proposed protective order?

MS. SHROFF: I got the protective order last night, your Honor. I have not reviewed it. I do plan to review it and compare it to the protective order that was signed by Judge Kaplan in *Ghailani*. I plan to do that. I inform the Court of that only because I've been litigating the issues of protective order in a case in the Eastern District, and we finally culminated those negotiations by using the Judge Kaplan protective order as a guide. But I don't think we're going to have that much of an issue with the protective order on the CIPA.

The bigger issue that I'm having, really, is that I don't really hear from government counsel an answer to the Court's question. Very close, very near, so far so good, I don't know really what that translates to. I do know that this team has been before many another judge that has told them either put out or move on. Judge Rakoff has set deadlines for them that they have all managed to meet. Judge Kaplan has done a similar situation. Judge Rakoff simply told the government whether they can control DOD or not is up to them. He sets a deadline, and then enforces that deadline.

I ask the Court to consider doing the same here, and I say that for two reasons, your Honor. The Rule 16 discovery that Ms. Tekeei is talking about, that has now been fully produced, it has rolled in since August of 2015. Now, sitting here today, the Court might think, August to February, it's not that long a time, but they've known for quite some time that this case is coming. Right?

There are search warrants. They've been tracking this case for a while. They have warrants that they issued on the people in Turkey and in other countries, and they knew for a while that they were anticipating an arrest of Mr. El Gammal. It's kind of disingenuous to say, oh, he got arrested in August, I'm producing the discovery, and I've done okay between August and February.

Mr. El Gammal would like me to inform the Court that

he wants a fairly prompt trial date. I would like to have some time to make motions, in the event that we have motions to make.

I understand that the Court can deem this a complex case and deny my application, but I would ask the Court, at this point, to set a firm deadline by which the government completes its CIPA production or says, okay, you're out of time; two, set a motion schedule now. We'd like 60 days to make our motion.

(Pause)

He wants 45 days to make a motion. I need 45 days to make a motion. I don't know how long they want to reply, and I just ask the Court to set some deadlines for them.

THE COURT: I don't know that I can, at this point based on the record that's before me, impose a strict deadline on the government to produce the CIPA materials. I'll go back to them in a second. But remind me when it was that Mr. El Gammal first appeared here?

MS. SHROFF: He first appeared here -- well, he first appeared in Arizona on 8-20, and then he appeared here on 9-16. He appeared here on 9-16. He appeared in Arizona -- you don't care when he appeared in Arizona, anyway, but he appeared here on 9-16.

THE COURT: Correct. Okay. I'm happy to set down a motion schedule now.

MS. SHROFF: Of course, the government was aware of the fact that he appeared in August in Arizona because they were in close ties with them, seeking to detain him there. I mean, I think there was correspondence between Mr. Quigley and his counterpart there when he was trying to get bail.

THE COURT: Can you give me an idea of the volume of the discovery that's been produced to date for Rule 16?

MS. SHROFF: Well, it's voluminous. I agree it's quite voluminous, but it's equally voluminous for us, and if we manage to get through it, they should be able to get through it. It's problematic for me for a couple of reasons, and I'll tell the Court why.

First of all, it's not produced in any orderly manner. Okay? The platform on which they've produced it is almost unworkable. So once we get the discovery from the government, we've actually had to move it onto a separate platform, and then review it in our office. And then having Mr. El Gammal have time and opportunity to review it is even more cumbersome because the computers at the MCC simply they just don't read the data in the way the government has presented.

THE COURT: Has the government presented the digital discovery to you in one platform or multiple platforms?

MS. SHROFF: No, I think it's in one platform.

THE COURT: Have you been able to translate it effectively to your systems?

MS. SHROFF: We've managed to buy a system to translate it, but the problem for him, who's incarcerated, is we have to put all of the discovery on disks because they won't let me give him a hard drive. I've tried to talk to Adam Johnson in MCC, who's actually very responsive. I'm not at all criticizing him. He's really tried to help us out.

But I think the only other recourse we may have is to write to the Court and ask for Mr. El Gammal have discovery hours on the third floor of legal. I was going to submit a letter later after today's appearance.

THE COURT: So Mr. El Gammal is not under SAM, correct?

MS. SHROFF: No, he's not under SAM. He's in general population, but he only has two days in the law library, and apparently he's getting some heat for hogging the computer.

THE DEFENDANT: They complain.

MS. SHROFF: Apparently, the other inmates also need time. Fairly so, because they want to view their own discovery. But his is so voluminous, like, for example, to go through the Facebook and the e-mails that the government has produced takes a long time.

THE COURT: I understand. If you want to make an application concerning Mr. El Gammal's computer time at the MCC, you go ahead and make that application.

Now, the government has represented, if I heard

to us.

Ms. Tekeei correctly, that they have turned over all of the Rule 16 discovery, which they are at least currently aware, and appear to have at least made the appropriate requests of the appropriate agencies of the CIPA documents that they believe are relevant. So now, that's the state of the record before me.

I'm happy to impose a deadline or impose a motion schedule concerning the motions that you might make. Are you able to tell the Court, as you stand here today, Ms. Shroff, what motions you would be making?

MS. SHROFF: I am, but I'd rather not.

THE COURT: Okay. So you want 45 days, six weeks?

MS. SHROFF: I do, but I just want to say one thing,

your Honor. Even last night I got two more pages of discovery, right? If they're finished with Rule 16 discovery, they're finished with Rule 16 discovery. Either they are or they're not. There has to come a time when the Court says to them, okay, this is it for Rule 16. It shouldn't keep dribbling on

THE COURT: No, no, I understand, but I don't know that it would be appropriate or feasible for me to tell the government, you are no longer allowed to provide Rule 16 discovery if some unknown piece of discovery comes in.

It's not fair. He wants to go to trial.

MS. SHROFF: Why not? They have a deadline. We have deadlines.

THE COURT: There could be a motion to preclude the government's use of that evidence, but I think you would be making a different type of application if they came across that discovery and then didn't turn it over to you.

MS. SHROFF: Only if it was Brady or Giglio, sure.

But if it is Rule 16, self-serving discovery, there has to be a deadline, your Honor. I'm asking the Court to impose that deadline. It's been since August. August, September, October, November, December, January, February, seven months to produce discovery; that's enough.

THE COURT: Let's see what comes in, and if anything else comes in that you are made aware of and you want to make a particular motion with respect to that, then you are, obviously, free to do so.

So, Ms. Rivera, give us a date six weeks from today for motions.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: March 24, 2016.

THE COURT: I'll give the government three weeks to respond.

MS. SHROFF: So, your Honor, I do believe that the rules allow you to set a deadline for Rule 16 discovery, as opposed to Gigglio and Brady, which is all throughout the case. I'm just saying. That's all I'm saying.

THE COURT: I understand. So let me turn to the government. Ms. Tekeei?

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, with respect to the Rule 16 discovery, we have produced it as it has become available to the government. We have produced it in the manner in which we received it and in which we are reviewing it. Many of the most recent productions were records that we were only recently able to extract, for example, the forensic reports if the electronic devices and also the actual images of the electronic devices. And we've produced those to Ms. Shroff as soon as the forensic analysts were able to get those to us.

THE COURT: And those electronic devices, these are cell phones, laptops, et cetera, were seized at or about the time of Mr. El Gammal's arrest?

MS. TEKEEI: Yes, your Honor. There are multiple.

There are four cell phones, a tablet, on iPad, a laptop hard

drive, some CDs, thumb drive, a Go Pro camera data, and so it's

quite a large volume of information.

In addition, we have done supplemental search warrants since his arrest, and we have been receiving those returns from the providers on a rolling basis. We have produced those to defense counsel as we have received them, and again, in the manner that we have received them.

We expect there may be additional items that we receive in response to our search warrants, and we would be producing those as soon as we obtain them. And so, you know, as your Honor makes the point, I'm sure Ms. Shroff would like

to see any additional documents that we obtain as this case goes forward.

In addition, our investigation has not stopped. Our investigations are ongoing. Ms. Shroff is aware of that, and so to the extent any additional documents or records are available, as the broader investigation continues, we will make those available to Ms. Shroff as soon as possible. As of this moment, we have produced everything in our possession that we are aware of that falls under Rule 16.

THE COURT: Ms. Shroff?

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, several of the search warrants that the government made to the Court, he was arrested in August, right? They have search warrants into November, December. They could have asked for those search warrants in August, in September, in October. They can't just say the delay is all because we're waiting on information coming in.

Their application to this Court was in November. You can't just stand there and say, hey, listen, we're still investigating, and as we keep investigating, we have an absolute right to keep augmenting. Under that scenario, Mr. El Gammal could be in prison for quite some time with no timetable at all.

We're not asking for something irrational. We're simply saying set a date by which they either produce or are precluded. At some point, we will make a motion to preclude if

this continues. But if their Rule 16 discovery is complete now, we're ready to move forward. In 45 days we'll put in our motions.

THE COURT: Okay. Again, based on the record that's been made before me, this matter has only been before me once or twice, and I don't believe that we had perhaps a single substantive appearance. I believe this is the first time, Ms. Shroff, that the defense has made the application or has complained about the lack of speed with which the government is producing its documents, or has complained about the government's continuing investigation.

I mean, it happens in all cases that the government is able to continue to investigate even indicted matters, and whether or not a particular defendant is prejudiced as a result of that continuing investigation is a matter that has to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

We're not at that point yet with respect to Mr. El Gammal, at the point where I tell the government, okay, that's it, fish or cut bait. You're going forward with the case that you currently have, the case that you indicted. But we may get there, and I'm sure that I will look to you to tell me when that matter has become unreasonable with respect to Mr. El Gammal, but as I've indicated, we're not there yet. Okay?

I would tell the government that we do now have a date

by which the defense is going to be making motions. I would ask that you speak to your colleagues and counterparts in Washington, or wherever else they might be, and let them know that, you know, the Court is very concerned about getting those classified documents, to the extent they are going to be made available to defense, that they be made as soon as possible. Okay?

MS. TEKEEI: Thank you, your Honor. We will do so.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, Ms. Tekeei?

MS. TEKEEI: Not for the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Shroff?

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may I just have one second?

THE COURT: Certainly.

(Pause)

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, the Court is correct that we have not raised the issue of delay with the Court. But I just want to be clear, we have urged the government and we've tried to accommodate their schedule. So this is the first time because we were hopeful that we wouldn't get here, that we've raised it now with the Court.

I just put on the record that Mr. El Gammal is still waiting on the return of his family's property. I'll take that up with Ms. Surratt because, as I informed him, that, you know, deadline has been a little bit more amorphous than the other set here, but we have nothing further to ask of the Court now.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Tekeei?

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, the government moves to exclude time between now and the motions deadline that the Court has set for defense counsel, so that defense counsel may continue to review the discovery and prepare their motions.

THE COURT: We're going to get the actual date in a second. Ms. Shroff?

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I think the time is automatically excluded under the Speedy Trial Act when there's motion practice.

THE COURT: But the motion has not yet been made. I can deem the motion made as of today, and the brief filed 45 or six weeks hence.

MS. SHROFF: Maybe I'm reading the Act wrong, but I think it's excluded. In any event, we don't have an objection because we need to time to make the motion.

THE COURT: There being no objection, I will exclude the time between now and -- Ms. Riviera?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: March 24th, 2016, the motion is due, and the opposition is due April 14th, 2016.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'll exclude the time between now and March 24 under the Speedy Trial Act. I find that Mr. El Gammal's interests in making this motion and reviewing the necessary discovery in support thereof outweigh the interests of the public in a speedy and public trial.

```
G2BPGAMC
      Accordingly, that time will be excluded.
 1
                Unless there's anything else, we are adjourned.
 2
 3
                MS. TEKEEI: Thank you, your Honor.
                (Adjourned)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```